



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,606	12/29/2003	Paul H. Bouchier	10001728-3	1340

7590 03/24/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PHAN, RAYMOND NGAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2111

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

4/L

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/750,606

Applicant(s)

BOUCHIER ET AL.

Examiner

Raymond Phan

Art Unit

2111

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 11-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-8, 11, 13-17, 19-22, 24 and 26-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 9, 12, 18, 23, 25 and 29 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12292003</u>.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.</p> |
|--|---|

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This application has been examined. Claims 1-9, 11-29 are pending.
2. The Group and/or Art Unit location of your application in the PTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Group Art Unit 2111.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 in Patent No. 6,725,317. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the omissions of, wherein at least one partition has at least two cell boards, in claim 1 are obvious expedients since elements of claims 1 of the present application still comprises the same components and functions,

a plurality of cell boards, with each cell board including at least one main processor;
a service processor that is connected to each of the cell boards;
data that describes a configuration for the computer system;
wherein each partition includes at least one cell board, and the service processor manages configuration of the partitions and wherein the service processor and each cell board stores a copy of the data.

as claim 1 of the patent. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 189 (ccPA 1963).

5. Claim 15 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 13 in Patent No. 6,725,317. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the omissions of, using at least one USB format bus to provide communications between the service processor and the cell boards, in claim 13 are obvious expedients since elements of claims 15 of the present application performs the same functions,

providing a service processor that is connected to each of the cell boards;
providing data, by the service processor, that describes an initial configuration for the computer system;

storing a copy of that data in the service processor and in each cell board;
managing configuration of the partitions via the service processor,
as claim 13 of the patent. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 189 (ccPA 1963).

6. Claim 27 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 24 in Patent No. 6,725,317. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct

from each other because the omissions of, wherein after reset, each cell enters a default configuration that excludes the other cells from being part of its partition, and the service processor changes the default configuration of each cell to another configuration, in claim 24 are obvious expedients since elements of claims 27 of the present application still comprises the same components and functions,

a plurality of cell boards, wherein each partition includes at least one cell board, and each cell board is capable of determining whether each of the other cell boards may be part of its partition independent of the other partition;

service processor that is connected of the cell boards via at least one bus, wherein the service processor manages configurations of the partitions, and the service processor and each cell board stores a copy of data that describes a configuration for the computer system.

as claim 24 of the patent. In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 189 (ccPA 1963).

Specification

7. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11, 13, 14-17, 19-22, 24, 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Okazawa et al. (US No. 6,378,021) in view of Kleinsorge et al. (US No. 6,226,734).

In regard to claims 1, 15, 27, Okazawa et al. disclose the multi-processor computer system comprising a plurality of processor boards with each board having at least one processor (see col. 4, lines 50-59); a switch processor that is connected to each of the processor boards (see col. 5, lines 8-40); wherein each partition includes at least one processor boards and that switch processor manages configuration of the partitions (see col. 6, lines 1-50); wherein at least one partition 11 has at least two cell boards (i.e. PBx8) (see figure 1, col. 4, lines 50-67). But Okazawa et al. do not specifically disclose the use of data that describes a configuration for the computer system and wherein service processor and each of the cell board maintain a copy of the data. However Kleinsorge et al. disclose the use of data that describes a configuration for the computer system and wherein each of the cell board maintains a copy of the data (see col. 8, line 36 through col. 9, line 54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Kleinsorge et al. into the teachings of Okazawa et al. because it would a flexible computer system having maximum resource availability and scalability.

In regard to claims 2, 16, Okazawa et al. disclose each partition is running an operating system that is independent of the other partitions (see col. 6, lines 15-23).

In regard to claims 3, 17, Okazawa et al. disclose each processor board is capable of being reassigned to another partition while the computer system is on-line (see col. 2, lines 61-65).

In regard to claims 5, 19, Okazawa et al. disclose the processor board may be replaced while the computer system is on-line (see col. 6, lines 23-50).

In regard to claims 6, 20, Okazawa et al. disclose the switch processor can command the operation of the processor boards (see col. 6, line 66 through col. 7, line 11).

In regard to claims 7, 21, Okazawa et al. disclose the switch processor can command the operation of the partitions (see col. 6, line 66 through col. 7, line 11).

In regard to claims 8, 22, Okazawa et al. disclose the switch processor can reset a partition (see col. 7, lines 2-11).

In regard to claims 11, 24, Kleinsorge et al. disclose wherein the configuration file managed by owner board (i.e. primary board) (see col. 8, line 36 through col. 9, line 54).

In regard to claim 13, Okazawa et al. disclose a microcontroller that handle the communication between the switch process and the processor board (see col. 5, lines 7-20).

In regard to claims 14, 26, Okazawa et al. disclose each partition configuring itself after switching (see col. 3, lines 36-50).

In regard to claim 28, Okazawa et al. disclose wherein after reset, each cell enters a default configuration that excludes the other cells from being part of its partition (see col. 6, lines 23-35).

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claims 4, 9, 12, 18, 23, 25, 29, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. The following is an Examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claims 4, 9, 12, 18, 23, 25, 29 are allowable over the

prior art of record because the Examiner found neither prior art cited in its entirety, nor based on the prior art, found any motivation to combine any of the said prior arts which teach wherein the service processor communicates with the cell boards via at least one USB format bus (claims 4, 18); wherein the service processor may be replaced while the computer is on-line (claims 9, 23); wherein information describing certain changes to the computer system are relayed to the service processor; the service processor modifies the data to correspond to the information; and the service processor distributes the modified data to the cell boards (claims 12, 25); wherein the service processor changes the default configuration of each cell board to another configuration (claim 29).

Conclusion

12. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11, 13, 14-17, 19-22, 24, 26-28 are rejected. Claims 4, 9, 12, 18, 23, 25, 29 are objected.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Raymond Phan, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3630. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30AM- 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's Primary, Paul Myers can be reached on (571) 272-3639 or via e-mail addressed to paul.myers@uspto.gov. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [raymond.phan@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 central telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

Raymond Phan

3/20/05

